



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/981,392	10/17/2001	Shell S. Simpson	10007682-1	7709

7590 11/28/2005
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

BATURAY, ALICIA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/981,392

Applicant(s)

SIMPSON, SHELL S.

Examiner

Alicia Baturay

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10172001</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the request for continued examination filed 12 September 2005.
2. Claim 1, 25, and 38 were amended.
3. Claims 1-46 are pending in this Office Action.
4. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12 September 2005 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
6. Claims 1-7, 11-13, 18-23, 25-35, 37-43, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being over by Adamske et al. (U.S. 6,615,234) and further in view of Savoray et al. (U.S. 6,631,200).

Adamske teaches the invention described as claimed including delivering an electronic document over a network and printing in hard copy form at a remote destination. The system described also includes a collaborative signature feature that allows each signatory to sign the document electronically (see Adamske, "Summary of the Invention").

7. As to claim 1, Adamske teaches a client program in a web-based environment (Adamske, Fig. 2, element 11; col. 4, lines 42-44), a method for controlling production and display of an image represented by data generated at a source service (Adamske, col. 6, lines 18-21), the data representing at least in part a predetermined graphic symbol referencing a particular symbol set (Adamske, col. 8, lines 24-36), the method comprising the steps of:

Accessing the source service (Adamske, col. 8, lines 46-48); dynamically generating a printable version of the image represented by the data at the source service under interactive control of the client program, the printable version including the predetermined graphic symbol referencing the particular symbol set (Adamske, col. 8, lines 46-67); referencing the printable version of the image represented by the data from a composition stored in an imaging store (Adamske, col. 8, lines 63-67); accessing the composition from a destination service; and if the destination service contains the particular symbol set and if the destination service is instructed to produce the printable version of the represented image, then forwarding the printable version of the represented image to the destination service and then producing the represented image including the predetermined graphic symbol under interactive control by the client program (Adamske, col. 9, lines 19-28).

Adamske does not explicitly teach mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set.

However, Savoray teaches where the particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing the predetermined graphic symbol on the represented image (Savoray, col. 4, lines 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Savoray in order to enable mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for authentication and verification of the author of the document.

8. As to claim 2, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 1, including the method where the represented image comprises a document (Adamske, col. 3, lines 27-30).
9. As to claim 3, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 2, including the method where the document is selected from the group consisting of legal instruments, financial instruments, governmental instruments, money orders, wills, and checks (Adamske, col. 6, line 58 – col. 7, line 4).
10. As to claim 4, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 1, including the method where the predetermined graphic symbol comprises a symbol of authentication (Adamske, col. 8, line 67 – col. 9, line 2).

11. As to claim 5, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 4, including the method where the symbol of authentication comprises at least one signature (Adamske, col. 8, line 67 – col. 9, line 2).

12. As to claim 6, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 1, including a symbol set (Adamske, col. 8, lines 24-36)

Adamske does not explicitly teach the symbol set as a font.

However, Savoray teaches the method where the particular symbol set is a font (Savoray, col. 4, lines 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Savoray in order to enable mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for authentication and verification of the author of the document.

13. As to claim 7, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 1, including the method where the predetermined graphic symbol comprises a predetermined string of characters (Adamske, col. 8, lines 24-27).

14. As to claim 11, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 1, including the method where the printable version of the represented image does not exist prior to the dynamically generating at the source service under interactive control of the client program (Adamske, col. 5, lines 15-24).

15. As to claim 12, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 1, including the method where a web content acting on behalf of an accessed destination service generates a display at the client program comprising controls that include user selectable production options and a preview version of the represented image based upon the user selected options and upon the capabilities of a production device represented by the accessed destination service (Adamske, Fig. 3; col. 5, lines 6-14).
16. As to claim 13, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 12, including the method where the production device comprises a print destination, where the web content is an executable content acting on behalf of the accessed destination service representing the print destination, and where the preview version of the represented image sequentially changes dynamically, based upon the capabilities of print destinations sequentially accessed through multiple destination services, prior to forwarding the printable version of the represented image to a destination service (Adamske, col. 3, line 64 – col. 4, line 8).
17. As to claim 18, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 12, including the method where the preview version of the image is retrieved by the accessed destination service from the imaging store (Adamske, col. 8, lines 63-67).
18. As to claim 19, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 12, including the method where the client program accesses the destination service using an access technique selected from the group consisting of redirection by a second executable content and directly

addressing the destination service via a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) (Adamske, col. 8, lines 54-63).

19. As to claim 20, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 19, including the method where the client program accesses the imaging store via the second executable content (Adamske, col. 6, lines 10-15).
20. As to claim 21, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 1, including the method where the printable version of the represented image is stored in a graphic store associated with the imaging store and managed indirectly from the client program (Adamske, col. 6, lines 10-15).
21. As to claim 22, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 1, including the method where the imaging store is associated with a user's identity (Adamske, col. 8, lines 29-45).
22. As to claim 23, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 22, including the method where the user's identity is accessed by an executable content acting on behalf of the destination service (Adamske, col. 8, lines 54-67).
23. As to claim 25, Adamske teaches a system for controlling printing and display of an image in a distributed computing environment, comprising:

A first computer (Adamske, Fig. 2, element 11; col. 4, lines 42-44); a second computer accessible from the first computer and operable to provide a first executable content to the first computer in response to a request from the first computer (Adamske, Fig. 2, element 22; col. 4, lines 51-53); the second computer further operable to dynamically generate and display a printable version of data representing the image under the interactive control of the first computer via the first executable content, the represented image comprising at least in part a predetermined graphic symbol referencing a particular symbol set (Adamske, col. 8, lines 46-67); an imaging store accessible from the second computer and operable to access and store a composition referencing the printable version of the data (Adamske, Fig. 2, element 26; col. 6, lines 10-12); and at least one destination computer accessible from the first computer and operable to access the composition, the destination computer representing a production device, such that, if the at least one the destination computer contains the particular symbol set, then the production device represented by the at least one the destination computer is operable to produce the represented image including printing the predetermined graphic symbol under interactive control of the first computer (Adamske, col. 9, lines 19-28).

Adamske does not explicitly teach mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set.

However, Savoray teaches where the particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing the predetermined graphic symbol on the represented image (Savoray, col. 4, lines 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Savoray in order to enable mapping a graphical

symbol to a symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for authentication and verification of the author of the document.

24. As to claim 26, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 25, including the method where the represented image comprises a document (Adamske, col. 3, lines 27-30).

25. As to claim 27, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 26, including the method where the document is selected from the group consisting of legal instruments, financial instruments, governmental instruments, money orders, wills, and checks (Adamske, col. 6, line 58 – col. 7, line 4).

26. As to claim 28, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 25, including the system where the predetermined graphic symbol comprises at least one signature (Adamske, col. 8, line 67 – col. 9, line 2).

Adamske does not explicitly teach the symbol set as a font.

However, Savoray teaches the method where the particular symbol set is a font (Savoray, col. 4, lines 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Savoray in order to enable mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for authentication and verification of the author of the document.

27. As to claim 29, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 25, including the system where the second computer comprises the first computer (Adamske, col. 4, lines 44-52).
28. As to claim 30, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 25, including the system where the second computer comprises the destination computer (Adamske, col. 4, lines 44-52).
29. As to claim 31, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 25, including the system where the first computer comprises the destination computer (Adamske, col. 3, line 61 – col. 4, line 8).
30. As to claim 32, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 25, including the system where the imaging store is associated with a graphic store configured to receive and store the printable version of the data, the first computer operable to manage indirectly the imaging store and the graphic store (Adamske, col. 8, lines 46-67).
31. As to claim 33, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 25, including the system where the at least one the destination computer is operable to access the printable version of the data in the imaging store (Adamske, col. 6, lines 3-15).

32. As to claim 34, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 33, including the method where the imaging store is associated with a user's identity (Adamske, col. 8, lines 29-45).
33. As to claim 35, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 34, including the system where the at least one destination computer is operable to access the user's identity using a process selected from the group consisting of directly accessing and accessing via executable content running in the first computer (Adamske, col. 8, lines 46-67).
34. As to claim 37, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 33, including the method where the production device comprises a print destination, where the web content is an executable content acting on behalf of the accessed destination service representing the print destination, and where the preview version of the represented image sequentially changes dynamically, based upon the capabilities of print destinations sequentially accessed through multiple destination services, prior to forwarding the printable version of the represented image to a destination service (Adamske, col. 3, line 64 – col. 4, line 8).
35. As to claim 38, Adamske teaches in a distributed computing environment, a computer (Adamske, Fig. 2, element 11; col. 4, lines 42-44) for controlling production and display of an image represented by data generated at a source service (Adamske, col. 6, lines 18-21), the data representing at least in part a predetermined graphic symbol referencing a particular symbol set (Adamske, col. 8, lines 24-36), the computer operable to:

Access the source service (Adamske, col. 8, lines 46-48); interactively direct the source service to dynamically generate a printable version of the represented image, the printable version including the predetermined graphic symbol referencing the particular symbol set (Adamske, col. 8, lines 46-67); reference the printable version of the represented image via a composition stored in an imaging store (Adamske, col. 8, lines 63-67); access a destination service; and if the destination service contains the particular symbol set, then interactively directing the destination service exclusively to access and produce the printable version of the represented image, including the predetermined graphic symbol (Adamske, col. 9, lines 19-28).

Adamske does not explicitly teach mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set.

However, Savoray teaches where the particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing the predetermined graphic symbol on the represented image (Savoray, col. 4, lines 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Savoray in order to enable mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for authentication and verification of the author of the document.

36. As to claim 39, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 38, including the method where the represented image comprises a document (Adamske, col. 3, lines 27-30).

37. As to claim 40, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 39, including the method where the document is selected from the group consisting of legal instruments, financial instruments, governmental instruments, money orders, wills, and checks (Adamske, col. 6, line 58 – col. 7, line 4).

38. As to claim 41, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 38, including the method where the predetermined graphic symbol comprises a symbol of authentication (Adamske, col. 8, line 67 – col. 9, line 2).

39. As to claim 42, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 41, including the method where the symbol of authentication comprises at least one signature (Adamske, col. 8, line 67 – col. 9, line 2).

40. As to claim 43, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 34, including a symbol set (Adamske, col. 8, lines 24-36)

Adamske does not explicitly teach the symbol set as a font.

However, Savoray teaches the method where the particular symbol set is a font (Powers, col. 8, lines 8-9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Savoray in order to enable mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for authentication and verification of the author of the document.

41. As to claim 46, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 38, including the method where a web content acting on behalf of an accessed destination service generates a display at the client program comprising controls that include user selectable production options and a preview version of the represented image based upon the user selected options and upon the capabilities of a production device represented by the accessed destination service (Adamske, Fig. 3; col. 5, lines 6-14).

42. Claims 8, 14-16, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adamske in view of Savoray and further in view of Powers (U.S. 6,438,584).

Adamske teaches the invention described as claimed including delivering an electronic document over a network and printing in hard copy form at a remote destination. The system described also includes a collaborative signature feature that allows each signatory to sign the document electronically (see Adamske, "Summary of the Invention").

43. As to claim 8, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 7, including the method where the predetermined graphic symbol comprises a predetermined string of characters (Adamske, col. 8, lines 24-27).

Adamske does not explicitly teach mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set.

However, Savoray teaches where the particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing the predetermined graphic symbol on the represented image (Savoray, col. 4, lines 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Savoray in order to enable mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for authentication and verification of the author of the document.

Adamske teaches the method where the predetermined graphic symbol comprises a predetermined string of characters (Adamske, col. 8, lines 24-27).

Adamske does not explicitly teach mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set.

However, Savoray teaches where the particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing the predetermined graphic symbol on the represented image (Savoray, col. 4, lines 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Savoray in order to enable mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for authentication and verification of the author of the document.

The combination of Adamske and Savoray does not explicitly teach the predetermined string of characters comprising of identification numbers, sequence numbers, dates, graphic coordinates, geographic coordinates, and codes.

However, Powers teaches the method where the predetermined string of characters comprises a string of alphanumeric characters selected from the group consisting of

identification numbers, sequence numbers, dates, graphic coordinates, geographic coordinates, and codes (Powers, col. 8, lines 32-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske and Savoray in view of Powers in order to have the predetermined string of characters include identification numbers, sequence numbers, dates, graphic coordinates, geographic coordinates, and codes. One would be motivated to do so in order to provide routing and delivery of electronic communications.

44. As to claim 14, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 12, the preview version of the represented image sequentially changes dynamically (Adamske, col. 3, line 64 – col. 4, line 8).

Adamske does not explicitly teach mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set.

However, Savoray teaches where the particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing the predetermined graphic symbol on the represented image (Savoray, col. 4, lines 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Savoray in order to enable mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for authentication and verification of the author of the document.

Adamske teaches the preview version of the represented image sequentially changes dynamically (Adamske, col. 3, line 64 – col. 4, line 8).

Adamske does not explicitly teach mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set.

However, Savoray teaches where the particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing the predetermined graphic symbol on the represented image (Savoray, col. 4, lines 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Savoray in order to enable mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for authentication and verification of the author of the document.

The combination of Adamske and Savoray does not explicitly teach the preview version changing as the user makes changes to it.

However, Powers teaches the method where the preview version changes dynamically, dependent on interactive user control settings at the client program (Powers, col. 10, lines 14-32).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske and Savoray in view of Powers in order to allow the preview version to change as the user makes changes to it. One would be motivated to do so in order to provide routing and delivery of electronic communications.

45. As to claim 15, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 12, including a predetermined graphic symbol referencing a particular symbol set (Adamske, col. 8, lines 24-36).

Adamske does not explicitly teach mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set.

However, Savoray teaches where the particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing the predetermined graphic symbol on the represented image (Savoray, col. 4, lines 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Savoray in order to enable mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for authentication and verification of the author of the document.

Adamske teaches a predetermined graphic symbol referencing a particular symbol set (Adamske, col. 8, lines 24-36).

Adamske does not explicitly teach mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set.

However, Savoray teaches where the particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing the predetermined graphic symbol on the represented image (Savoray, col. 4, lines 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Savoray in order to enable mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for authentication and verification of the author of the document.

The combination of Adamske and Savoray does not explicitly teach the predetermined graphic symbol being displayed only when the client program accesses a service that contains the symbol set.

However, Powers teaches the method where the predetermined graphic symbol is displayed only when the client program accesses a destination service that contains the particular symbol set (Powers, col. 7, lines 32-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske and Savoray in view of Powers in order to restrict the access to the predetermined graphic symbol, allowing it only to be displayed when the client program accesses a service that contains the symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to provide routing and delivery of electronic communications.

46. As to claim 16, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 12, including a predetermined graphic symbol referencing a particular symbol set (Adamske, col. 8, lines 24-36).

Adamske does not explicitly teach mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set.

However, Savoray teaches where the particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing the predetermined graphic symbol on the represented image (Savoray, col. 4, lines 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Savoray in order to enable mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for authentication and verification of the author of the document.

Adamske teaches a predetermined graphic symbol referencing a particular symbol set (Adamske, col. 8, lines 24-36).

Adamske does not explicitly teach mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set.

However, Savoray teaches where the particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing the predetermined graphic symbol on the represented image (Savoray, col. 4, lines 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Savoray in order to enable mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for authentication and verification of the author of the document.

The combination of Adamske and Savoray does not explicitly teach not displaying the predetermined symbol.

However, Powers teaches the method where the predetermined graphic symbol is not displayed (Powers, col. 10, lines 18-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske and Savoray in view of Powers in order to not display the predetermined symbol. One would be motivated to do so in order to provide routing and delivery of electronic communications.

47. As to claim 24, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 22, including where the imaging store is associated with a user's identity (Adamske, col. 8, lines 29-45).

Adamske does not explicitly teach mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set.

However, Savoray teaches where the particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing the predetermined graphic symbol on the represented image (Savoray, col. 4, lines 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Savoray in order to enable mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for authentication and verification of the author of the document.

Adamske teaches where the imaging store is associated with a user's identity (Adamske, col. 8, lines 29-45).

Adamske does not explicitly teach mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set.

However, Savoray teaches where the particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing the predetermined graphic symbol on the represented image (Savoray, col. 4, lines 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Savoray in order to enable mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for authentication and verification of the author of the document.

The combination of Adamske and Savoray does not explicitly teach the user's identity being accessed directly by the destination service.

However, Powers teaches the method where the user's identity is accessed directly by the destination service (Power, col. 6, lines 19-21).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske and Savoray in view of Power in order to enable the user's identity to be accessed directly by the destination service. One would be motivated to do so in order to provide routing and delivery of electronic communications.

48. Claims 9, 10, 36, 44 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adamske in view of Savoray and further in view of Shima (U.S. 6,369,909).

Adamske teaches the invention described as claimed including delivering an electronic document over a network and printing in hard copy form at a remote destination. The system described also includes a collaborative signature feature that allows each signatory to sign the document electronically (see Adamske, "Summary of the Invention").

49. As to claim 9, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 1, including accessing the composition from a destination service; and if the destination service contains the particular symbol set and if the destination service is instructed to produce the printable version of the represented image, then forwarding the printable version of the represented image to the destination service and then producing the represented image including the predetermined graphic symbol under interactive control by the client program (Adamske, col. 9, lines 19-28).

Adamske does not explicitly teach mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set.

However, Savoray teaches where the particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing the predetermined graphic symbol on the represented image (Savoray, col. 4, lines 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Savoray in order to enable mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for authentication and verification of the author of the document.

Adamske teaches accessing the composition from a destination service; and if the destination service contains the particular symbol set and if the destination service is instructed to produce the printable version of the represented image, then forwarding the printable version of the represented image to the destination service and then producing the represented image including the predetermined graphic symbol under interactive control by the client program (Adamske, col. 9, lines 19-28).

Adamske does not explicitly teach mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set.

However, Savoray teaches where the particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing the predetermined graphic symbol on the represented image (Savoray, col. 4, lines 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Savoray in order to enable mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for authentication and verification of the author of the document.

The combination of Adamske and Savoray does not explicitly teach printing the document without the predetermined graphic.

However, Shima teaches where, if the destination service does not contain the particular symbol set and if the destination service is instructed to produce the printable version of the represented image, then producing the represented image excluding the predetermined graphic symbol (Shima, col. 10, lines 40-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Adamske and Savoray in view of Shima in order enable printing of the document without the predetermined graphic. One would be motivated to do so in order to provide an environment capable of receiving and printing a composite document containing a plurality of resources of various file formats.

50. As to claim 10, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 9, including accessing the composition from a destination service; and if the destination service contains the particular symbol set and if the destination service is instructed to produce the printable version of the represented image, then forwarding the printable version of the represented image to the destination service and then producing the represented image including the predetermined graphic symbol under interactive control by the client program (Adamske, col. 9, lines 19-28).

Adamske does not explicitly teach mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set.

However, Savoray teaches where the particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing the predetermined graphic symbol on the represented image (Savoray, col. 4, lines 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Savoray in order to enable mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for authentication and verification of the author of the document.

Adamske teaches accessing the composition from a destination service; and if the destination service contains the particular symbol set and if the destination service is instructed to produce the printable version of the represented image, then forwarding the printable version of the represented image to the destination service and then producing the represented image including the predetermined graphic symbol under interactive control by the client program (Adamske, col. 9, lines 19-28).

Adamske does not explicitly teach mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set.

However, Savoray teaches where the particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing the predetermined graphic symbol on the represented image (Savoray, col. 4, lines 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Savoray in order to enable mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for authentication and verification of the author of the document.

The combination of Adamske and Savoray does not explicitly teach the use of a substitute graphic.

However, Shima teaches the method where, if the destination service does not contain the particular symbol set and if the destination service is instructed to produce the printable version of the represented image, then producing a substitute graphic symbol in place of the predetermined graphic symbol by using a substitute symbol set (Shima, col. 10, lines 40-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Adamske and Savoray in view of Shima in order to enable the use of a substitute graphic. One would be motivated to do so in order to provide an environment capable of receiving and printing a composite document containing a plurality of resources of various file formats.

51. As to claim 36, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 25, including at least one destination computer accessible from the first computer and operable to access the composition, the destination computer representing a production device, such that, if the at least one the destination computer contains the particular symbol set, then the production device represented by the at least one the destination computer is operable to produce the represented image including printing the predetermined graphic symbol under interactive control of the first computer (Adamske, col. 9, lines 19-28).

Adamske does not explicitly teach mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set.

However, Savoray teaches where the particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing the predetermined graphic symbol on the represented image (Savoray, col. 4, lines 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Savoray in order to enable mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for authentication and verification of the author of the document.

Adamske teaches at least one destination computer accessible from the first computer and operable to access the composition, the destination computer representing a production device, such that, if the at least one the destination computer contains the particular symbol set, then the production device represented by the at least one the destination computer is operable to produce the represented image including printing the predetermined graphic symbol under interactive control of the first computer (Adamske, col. 9, lines 19-28).

Adamske does not explicitly teach mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set.

However, Savoray teaches where the particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing the predetermined graphic symbol on the represented image (Savoray, col. 4, lines 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Savoray in order to enable mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for authentication and verification of the author of the document.

The combination of Adamske and Savoray does not explicitly teach printing the document without the predetermined graphic.

However, Shima teaches where, if the destination service does not contain the particular symbol set and if the destination service is instructed to produce the printable version of the represented image, then producing the represented image excluding the predetermined graphic symbol (Shima, col. 10, lines 40-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Adamske and Savoray in view of Shima in order enable printing of the document without the predetermined graphic. One would be motivated to do so in order to provide an environment capable of receiving and printing a composite document containing a plurality of resources of various file formats.

52. As to claim 44, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 38, including access a destination service; and if the destination service contains the particular symbol set, then interactively directing the destination service exclusively to access and produce the printable version of the represented image, including the predetermined graphic symbol (Adamske, col. 9, lines 19-28).

Adamske does not explicitly teach mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set.

However, Savoray teaches where the particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing the predetermined graphic symbol on the represented image (Savoray, col. 4, lines 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Savoray in order to enable mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for authentication and verification of the author of the document.

Adamske teaches access a destination service; and if the destination service contains the particular symbol set, then interactively directing the destination service exclusively to access and produce the printable version of the represented image, including the predetermined graphic symbol (Adamske, col. 9, lines 19-28).

Adamske does not explicitly teach mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set.

However, Savoray teaches where the particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing the predetermined graphic symbol on the represented image (Savoray, col. 4, lines 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Savoray in order to enable mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for authentication and verification of the author of the document.

The combination of Adamske and Savoray does not explicitly teach printing the document without the predetermined graphic.

However, Shima teaches where, if the destination service does not contain the particular symbol set and if the destination service is instructed to produce the printable version of the represented image, then producing the represented image excluding the predetermined graphic symbol (Shima, col. 10, lines 40-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Adamske and Savoray in view of Shima in order enable printing of the document without the predetermined graphic. One would be motivated to do so in order to provide an environment capable of receiving and printing a composite document containing a plurality of resources of various file formats.

53. As to claim 45, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 44, including access a destination service; and if the destination service contains the particular symbol set, then interactively directing the destination service exclusively to access and produce the printable version of the represented image, including the predetermined graphic symbol (Adamske, col. 9, lines 19-28).

Adamske does not explicitly teach mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set.

However, Savoray teaches where the particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing the predetermined graphic symbol on the represented image (Savoray, col. 4, lines 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Savoray in order to enable mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for authentication and verification of the author of the document.

Adamske teaches access a destination service; and if the destination service contains the particular symbol set, then interactively directing the destination service exclusively to access

and produce the printable version of the represented image, including the predetermined graphic symbol (Adamske, col. 9, lines 19-28).

Adamske does not explicitly teach mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set.

However, Savoray teaches where the particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing the predetermined graphic symbol on the represented image (Savoray, col. 4, lines 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Savoray in order to enable mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for authentication and verification of the author of the document.

The combination of Adamske and Savoray does not explicitly teach the use of a substitute graphic.

However, Shima teaches the method where, if the destination service does not contain the particular symbol set and if the destination service is instructed to produce the printable version of the represented image, then producing a substitute graphic symbol in place of the predetermined graphic symbol by using a substitute symbol set (Shima, col. 10, lines 40-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Adamske and Savoray in view of Shima in order to enable the use of a substitute graphic. One would be motivated to do so in order to provide an environment capable of receiving and printing a composite document containing a plurality of resources of various file formats.

54. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adamske in view of Savoray in view of Powers and further in view of Shima.

Adamske teaches the invention described as claimed including delivering an electronic document over a network and printing in hard copy form at a remote destination. The system described also includes a collaborative signature feature that allows each signatory to sign the document electronically (see Adamske, "Summary of the Invention").

55. With respect to claim 17, Adamske teaches the invention described in claim 16, including a predetermined graphic symbol referencing a particular symbol set (Adamske, col. 8, lines 24-36).

Adamske does not explicitly teach mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set.

However, Savoray teaches where the particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing the predetermined graphic symbol on the represented image (Savoray, col. 4, lines 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Savoray in order to enable mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for authentication and verification of the author of the document.

The combination of Adamske and Savoray does not explicitly teach not displaying the predetermined symbol.

However, Powers teaches the method where the predetermined graphic symbol is not displayed (Powers, col. 10, lines 18-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Powers in order to not display the predetermined symbol. One would be motivated to do so in order to provide routing and delivery of electronic communications.

Adamske a predetermined graphic symbol referencing a particular symbol set (Adamske, col. 8, lines 24-36).

Adamske does not explicitly teach mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set.

However, Savoray teaches where the particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing the predetermined graphic symbol on the represented image (Savoray, col. 4, lines 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Savoray in order to enable mapping a graphical symbol to a symbol set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for authentication and verification of the author of the document.

The combination of Adamske and Savoray does not explicitly teach not displaying the predetermined symbol.

However, Powers teaches the method where the predetermined graphic symbol is not displayed (Powers, col. 10, lines 18-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Adamske in view of Powers in order to not display the predetermined

symbol. One would be motivated to do so in order to provide routing and delivery of electronic communications.

The combination of Adamske, Savoray and Powers does not explicitly teach the use of a proxy graphic.

However, Shima teaches the method where, if the client program accesses a destination service that contains the particular symbol set, a proxy graphic symbol is displayed in place of the predetermined graphic symbol, the proxy graphic symbol when displayed providing affirmation that the particular symbol set is contained in the destination service (Shima, col. 10, lines 40-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Adamske, Savoray and Powers in view of Shima in order to enable the use of a proxy graphic. One would be motivated to do so in order to provide an environment capable of receiving and printing a composite document containing a plurality of resources of various file formats.

Response to Arguments

56. Applicant's arguments filed 12 September 2005 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive for the reasons set forth below.

57. ***Applicant Argues:*** Applicant states "Adamske fails to teach or suggest at least 'wherein said particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing said predetermined graphic symbol on said represented image,' as recited in [the independent claims], since a signature is stored as an image file in Adamske and is not mapped in accordance with a particular symbol set."

In Response: The examiner respectfully submits that Applicant's arguments with respect to the independent claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia Baturay whose telephone number is (571) 272-3981. The examiner can normally be reached at 7:30am - 5pm, Monday - Thursday, and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Alicia Baturay
November 17, 2005


SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER